

MYP moderation report

School

Victoria Shanghai
Academy

Subject:

MATHEMATICS

Level:

MY

Component:

INTERNAL ASSESSMENT

This report should be read in conjunction with the general report for this subject.

Section A General Comments

Was the correct number of student folders submitted?

Yes

If not, was an adequate explanation given?

N/A

Was there a separate background information folder?

Yes

Was the correct distribution of comparatively good, average and comparatively weak student work included?

Yes

If not, was an adequate explanation given?

N/A

Were the prescribed minimum tasks included?

No

Was the moderation checklist included?

Yes

Was the previous year's report included?

Yes

Were unit planners included?

Yes

Were the F3.1 forms completed correctly?

Yes

Was the correct number of judgments given against each criterion?

No

Were the same tasks included for all students?

Yes

If not, was an adequate explanation given?

N/A

Was the sample easy to follow?

No

Had recommendations from the previous report been followed?

Some

Section B Assessment tasks

Task 1 (Please insert title)

Bench

Brief description of the task

This task required students to design an outdoor water front bench with canopy. They were required to investigate different designs and then model one of their own providing an accurate sketch, a set of equations describing various parts of the curves used and a description of how the design came about and why certain features were used. Students were given five days to complete this task.

Did the design of the task allow students to reach the highest levels of the criteria?

No

Comments

Regarding criterion A, there was no information in the background folder as to what part of this assessment was unfamiliar to the students, there was a slight hint that to gain a 7-8 a student would need to research an equation on the internet. This was deemed insufficient by the moderation team. Therefore the highest level possible for this assessment was a level 6.

Regarding criteria C and D, the task was suitable for assessment against these criteria.

Comments on the application of the assessment criteria and any change of levels

For Samuel Wong the criterion A level was lowered from 8 to 6 as the task did not allow for a level 7-8 to be given. For criterion C the level was lowered from 5 to 3 because he only used sufficient language and was only able to move between different forms of representation with some success. For criterion D the level was lowered from 6 to 4 since he was only able to attempt to justify accuracy and he made no suggestion to improve method.

For Iona Ishigami the criterion A level was lowered from 7 to 6 as the assessment task did not allow for a level 7-8 to be given.

For Timothy Shan the criterion A level was lowered from 6 to 4 as he was only able to sometimes make appropriate deductions. For criterion C the level was lowered from 5 to 4 because he did not move effectively between different form of representation. For criterion D the level was lowered from 6 to 4 since there were no suggestions for improvement and he did not critically explain why his results made sense.

For Kenny Kung the criterion A level was lowered from 6 to 4 as he was only able to sometimes make appropriate deductions. For criterion C the level was lowered from 3 to 2 because he was only able to use basic mathematical language and his lines of reasoning were difficult to follow, for criterion D the level was lowered from 4 to 2 since there was only a brief attempt made to explain why his results made sense.

For Amos Wong the criterion C level was lowered from 3 to 2 as he was only able to use basic mathematical language and his lines of reasoning were difficult to follow. For criterion D the level was lowered from 3 to 2 because there was only a brief attempt made to explain why his results made sense.

For Vivian Law the criterion C level was lowered from 5 to 2 as she was only able to use basic mathematical language and her lines of reasoning were difficult to follow. For criterion D the level was lowered from 4 to 2 because there was only a brief attempt made to explain why her results made sense.

For Kiral Lam and Ronald Yeung the levels for all three criteria were lowered to 1 as their was only a brief attempt at the task and the reports were of poor quality.

Was the background information adequate?

No

Comments

There was a sample answer key given however, it lacked detail as to what was expected from the student to achieve a particular level. Each student's piece of work included details on the application of the criteria, however

the details provided did not always match the standards laid out by the published MYP assessment criteria.

Task 2 (Please insert title)

Bacterial infections and penicillin

Brief description of the task

This task required students to investigate a given set of data, find a pattern in the data and develop a rule or equation that would fit the data. They were then required to use a different technique to justify why their rule was correct. They were then given a new set of data for which they had to develop a model. The students were given a double period (no time specified) to complete the task under test conditions.

Did the design of the task allow students to reach the highest levels of the criteria?

Yes

Comments

It was clear that some of the advice from the previous years had been followed in that the task now allowed students to select and apply their own problem-solving techniques without any guidance being given. The task was therefore found to be suitable for assessment against criterion C, but is still less suitable for assessment against criterion B because the school sample has been entered for standard mathematics and the task involves exponential functions and logarithmic functions which are intended for extended mathematics students as found in the extended mathematics framework, (in the section 'Framework for mathematics' in the MYP Mathematics guide, updated on the OCC 2010). This stated in last year's moderation report.

Comments on the application of the assessment criteria and any change of levels

For Samuel Wong the criterion B level was lowered from 7 to 6 as he did not provide any justifications or proofs and arrived at his rules with no clear indication as to the process followed to find the rule.

For Timothy Shan the criterion C level was lowered from 5 to 4 as he was only able to move between different forms of representation with some success.

For Kiral Lam the level for criterion B was lowered from 2 to 0 as he only managed to describe the pattern using simple words, he did not show any understanding of how to find or describe a pattern. For criterion C the level was lowered from 2 to 1 as he was only able to draw one graph from the given data.

For Ronald Yeung the levels for both criteria were lowered to 0 as he failed to even write a simple description or even draw a graph.

Was the background information adequate?

No

Comments

There was a sample answer key given however it was still unclear as to what was expected from the student to achieve a particular level. Each students piece of work included details on the application of the criteria, however the details provided did not always match the standards laid out by the published MYP assessment criteria.

Task 3 (Please insert title)

Human footprint - Tsang Kwan O landfill

Brief description of the task

This task required students to investigate the increase of waste dumping at a landfill site in Hong Kong. The task required students to answer a series of questions involving sequences and series to model a trend in the data given.

Did the design of the task allow students to reach the highest levels of the criteria?

No

Comments

There was a discrepancy between the Unit Plan and the assessment, the Unit Plan indicated it was a criteria B and C assessment, the F3.1 form and background information indicated it was a criteria A and D assessment. In

the background information there was no indication as to the unfamiliar context or situation for level 7-8 on criterion A, therefore the assessment does not allow students to reach the highest levels; the highest level for this assessment against criterion A was therefore 6.

Comments on the application of the assessment criteria and any change of levels

For Samuel Wong the criterion A level was lowered from 7 to 6 as the assessment task did not allow for a level 7-8 to be given. The level for criterion D was awarded an X as the moderating team was unable to verify the work due to being unable to read the photocopied student work.

For Timothy Shan the criteria A and D level were awarded an X as the moderating team were unable to verify any of the work due to being unable to read the photocopied student work.

For Kenny Kung the levels for criteria A and D were lowered from 5 to 4 as he was only sometimes able to make appropriate deductions and he was unable to critically explain why his results made sense or provide suggestions for improvement.

For Kiral Lam the level for criterion D was lowered from 2 to 0 as did not provide any explanations, not even in the simplest form.

Was the background information adequate?

No

Comments

There was a sample answer key given, however it was still unclear as to what was expected from the student to achieve a particular level. Each student's piece of work included details on the application of the criteria, however the details provided did not always match the standards laid out by the published MYP assessment criteria.

Task 4 (Please insert title)

Broad-based assessment

Brief description of the task

This task was submitted as a broad-based assessment, however it was submitted under criteria B and C. It was therefore deemed to be an unsuitable assessment task. The task consisted of a series of five questions of which students were to answer three. The students were given a double period (no time specified) to complete the task under test conditions.

Did the design of the task allow students to reach the highest levels of the criteria?

No

Comments

The task was unsuitable as a broad-based test as it did not assess the students against criterion A.

The task was unsuitable as a criterion B assessment as it did not allow students to select and apply their own problem-solving techniques and the problems were not complex enough in nature for students as they were too short and guided to allow any problem solving to take place.

The task was unsuitable as a criterion C assessment as it did not allow students to move between different forms of representation in any one question.

Comments on the application of the assessment criteria and any change of levels

NM was awarded to all students for criterion B. The same would have occurred for criterion C, but there were already two judgments for this criterion.

Was the background information adequate?

No

Comments

Simple solution sheets were provided. Each student's piece of work included details on the application of the criteria, however the details provided did not always match the standards laid out by the published MYP

assessment criteria.

Section C Summary of the use of the assessment criteria

Were there any discrepancies in the levels awarded?

Yes

Comments (This box is for brief general comments on any problematic criteria)

All of the tasks required changes in levels for the assessed criteria.

It is important that criterion A assessments clearly identify unfamiliar questions or contexts, it is also important that the reasons as to why these questions are deemed unfamiliar is included.

Please ensure that criterion B assessments allow for students to select and apply their own problems-solving techniques to ensure the highest levels can be reached.

It is important that criterion C assessments allow students to move between different forms of representation which includes formulae, diagrams, tables, charts, graphs and models. It is not enough for a student just to show working process.

In general the levels awarded for criterion D were too high. For students to achieve in the top band they must satisfy all the requirements within that band, that is they must critically explain their results, provide explanations on the importance to real life, justify their degree of accuracy and suggest improvements to their mathematical methods.

Section D

Are there any points that must be addressed for future samples in order to comply with moderation requirements?

Yes

Points

A broad-based test must be assessed against criterion A and must be part of the next sample for moderation.

For criterion A tasks, the unfamiliar questions must clearly be identified to allow students to reach the highest levels of the criterion.

Do not send photocopied work that is not clear. Most of the work was difficult to read, some impossible because of this.

When awarding achievement levels, ensure that the student work matches the statements given in the published MYP assessment criteria.

Do not include copies of published descriptors for each criteria for each task for each student, only include task-specific clarifications if developed for the tasks.

Schools are reminded that they should begin using the new MYP Mathematics guide (January 2011) from September 2011 for final assessment in June 2012.

Are there any suggestions that the school might wish to consider?

Yes

Suggestions

Consider writing criterion A assessments by organizing questions by descriptor.

For investigations consider writing task-specific clarifications as these details help to clarify what is required by the student to achieve a particular level.

Include the following information to help guide students to achieve in the top level for criterion B: Indicate whether a

justification or proof is required.

Include the following information to help guide students to achieve in the top level for criterion C: Please provide detailed equations, formulae, diagrams, tables, charts, graphs and models to help support your work.

Consider providing the students with tasks that require application of the content within the framework so that the students can attain the best possible achievement levels.

Consider entering the more able students for extended mathematics.

Consider including the following questions to help guide students to achieve in the top level for criterion D:

Why do your results make sense in the context of the problem?

Consider the context of the task, why did you choose that degree of accuracy?

How do your results relate to everyday life?

How could you have solved the problem differently?

The moderation team thanks you for submitting the sample and hopes that the report will be of assistance during the next academic year.